



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,993	03/31/2004	Hideki Kuwajima	43890-672	6416
<div>7590 12/11/2007 McDERMOTT, WILL &amp; EMERY 600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096</div>			<div>EXAMINER MAGEE, CHRISTOPHER R</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2627</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 12/11/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/812,993	KUWAJIMA, HIDEKI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Christopher R. Magee	2627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher R. Magee. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Nathaniel McQueen. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 03 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 8 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamamura et al. (JP 09-204766 and Ohnishi et al. (US 6,751,092 B1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1) Col. 6, lines 64-67 of Ohnishi does not teach or suggest buckling of shock-absorbing members. The passage discusses how shock-absorbing members will be horizontally deformed if a lid member of the disk drive is mounted by sliding the lid member. The passage further states that this deformation, due to friction, would reduce the shock absorbing effect. 2) Neither Ohnishi nor Yamamura teach or disclose "buckling" of the shock-absorbing members as intended by the present application. As is shown in Fig. 2 of the present application, the base part 181 buckles by bending angularly. In contrast, the shock absorbing members of Yamamura compress elastically, as shown in Fig. 8C-D of Yamamura. Furthermore, when the bottom shock absorbing members compress, simultaneously, the top members elongate. Thus, even if the shock absorbing members of Ohnishi were combined with Yamamura, they still would not buckle as claimed in the present invention. 3) The two shock absorbing members of Ohnishi shown in Fig. 9 still both absorb shock by elastic deformation. This is discussed on pages 3 and 5 of the specification of the present application. As such, they do not buckle, as claimed in the present application. 4) All the arguments set forth in the response of April 5, 2007 are included as well. The Examiner indicates that Ohnishi and Yamamura do not disclose all of the limitations of the claims of the present invention, especially the "buckling" of the shock absorbing members. Upon filing a response to the final rejection, the Examiner will withdraw the finality of the action and conduct a further search/consideration.